



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,438	12/30/2003	Volker Weiss	DOC/US/0309	2379
27774	7590	12/14/2005	EXAMINER HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE	
MAYER, FORTKORT & WILLIAMS, PC 251 NORTH AVENUE WEST 2ND FLOOR WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT 3727	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

E

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/748,438	WEISS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robin A. Hylton	3727	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9-13-04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the objectionable phrase "the invention relates to". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-20 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "one object or more objects in claim 1 is awkward. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims are rejected for the following reasons:

It is unclear what is intended by and what structure is represented by "cup-type compartment".

What is the structural difference between the "cup-type compartment" in claim 1 and the "beverage container" of claim 3?

Dependent claims not specifically mentioned are rejected as depending from rejected base claims since they inherently contain the same deficiencies therein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 3727

5. Claims 1,3,4,10,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Farnsworth et al (US 2004/0031797).

See figure 12 depicting a cover **1200** comprising an inner component **1204**, outer component **1218** and disc **62** over a container comprising a cup **50**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2,11,12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Farnsworth.

Regarding the angle of the two main surfaces of the cavity, the drawing figures clearly depict the angle to be between 0° and 90°. The drawings further appear to disclose the angle to be between 30° and 70°. See MPEP 2125 discussing the use of drawings as prior art.

Wherein it can be argued the cavity is not expressly disclosed as being between 30° and 70° degrees, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cavity with an angle as claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, the embodiment of figure 12 illustrates a “phone card” by way of example, but is not limited thereto. The disclosure illustrates compact disks, compact business cards, and phone cards are all used in conjunction with the inventive cup lid(s). Thus, substituting one type of disk for another would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as known structural equivalents.

Art Unit: 3727

8. Claims 6,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnsworth.

Farnsworth teaches the claimed container except is silent regarding the specific dimensions set forth in the claim(s).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify the axis of the opening and the axis of the cavity to be radially offset by the specific dimensions set forth in the claims, i.e., 1- 20 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 14, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the cavity of a cylindrical shape since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

9. Claims 8,9,15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Farnsworth.

The specific embodiment of figure 12 does not specify using a compact disc with the lid illustrated therein. However, the disclosure of Farnsworth teaches utilizing the lids for holding various objects including compact discs.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a compact disc in the lid of the embodiment of Figure 12 as disclosed by the patent itself. Doing so is an obvious matter of design choice and intended use of the container for marketing purposes.

Art Unit: 3727

Regarding claim 20, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the cavity of a cylindrical shape since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnsworth. Farnsworth teaches the claimed container except for the cavity being cylindrical. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the cavity of a cylindrical shape since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 7 appears to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Various prior art closures teaching features similar to those disclosed and/or claimed are cited for their disclosures.

13. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (571) 273-8300. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify

Art Unit: 3727

the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

14. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No. _____ is being facsimiled to The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below:

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

Signature_____

Date _____

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4540. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse, can be reached on (571) 272-4544.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RAH
December 2, 2005



Robin A. Hylton
Primary Examiner
GAU 3727